

FACING CHALLENGES AFTER CLASS SIZE REDUCTION 1990-1998

Linda G. Bond, Dennis S. Tierney and Phil A. Fitch

“Needless to say, this has been a challenging time.”

Dr. Carolyn Ellner, November 1998, at the close of her two-year term as
Commission Chair

Challenging it was. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, California began to emerge from a time of economic depression brought about by a changing economy and by government cutbacks in military spending. In addition, the Proposition 13 effort to cap local property taxes had resulted in greater state-level involvement in the funding for public education. Although California had traditionally had an activist Legislature with regard to educational issues, the beginnings of the last decade of the 20th Century brought an intensified interest in the performance of the public school system.

The shift from an industrial economy to a knowledge-based economy was as wrenching and profound a shift as the shift from an agricultural economy to an industrial economy that had occurred some one hundred years earlier. Exemplified by the decline in manufacturing and the rise in jobs generated by “Silicon Valley,” the number of union jobs in California decreased while the basic knowledge and skill requirements for most blue collar jobs were increasing. Additionally, as a significant portion of the Pacific Rim economy, California employers and policy makers were aware of the increasing global nature of the world’s economy and fretted over the ability of American workers to compete with workers from other nations.

The demographic engine in California was again in high gear. California experienced a major increase in population as immigration from Asia and Central and South America to the United States grew rapidly, with one-third of all immigrants to the U.S. settling in California. Coupled with a relatively young population, California’s school population began climbing faster than the national average until, in the mid-1980s, California added over 600 new

elementary students every day to its public school rosters; public school enrollment grew 21% that decade.

In the July 1992 issue of *Trends*, the Los Angeles County Office of Education reported that California had emerged as the most ethnically diverse state, ranking second (behind only Hawaii) in percentage of Asian/Pacific Islanders (9.6%), second (behind New Mexico) in Hispanics (25.8%), and 23rd in Blacks (7.4%). According to *EdSource*, “California had the largest school enrollment of any state, but the sheer size is still dramatic.” In 1994-95, California’s K-12 enrollment totaled 5,341,025 – a number almost equal to the entire population of the state of Indiana. California’s child population was growing faster than the general population. “About 18% of California’s population is in the school-age years between 5 and 17,” said *EdSource*. Public school enrollment increased by almost 1.2 million students from 1984-1994, however enrollments in teacher education programs had fallen in the early 1980’s in response to a brief period of teacher surplus and the fall-out from Proposition 13. Thus, there were early signs that California was again heading into a time of inadequate supply of teachers.

Policymakers were alarmed by a series of reports suggesting that American schools were inferior to schools in the other industrial nations of the world and that American students were not being prepared for the coming world economy. California schools were judged as less adequate than other states’ school systems and the limitations on school spending created by the tax reforms of the late 1970’s revealed a steep drop in dollar support for public education in California. Moreover, critics of the public schools noted repeatedly that the individuals who were intending to teach came from the lower quartiles of college student ability, and that the brightest of those who entered teaching left soonest. Although some researchers questioned whether the data were being miscast to support a political agenda, public concern increased.

Concerns also were mounting about the quality and effectiveness of training for those who decided to teach in the public schools. Issues over whether professional preparation was needed, how much was warranted and the form preparation should take were repeatedly debated. Critics of educator preparation still downplayed the need for pedagogical training while championing the need for rigorous preparation in subject matter. Others argued as

passionately for stronger standards of pedagogical preparation and decried the efforts to reduce education coursework. Some education critics even contended that the state should abandon its practice of awarding credentials and authorize local principals to use their judgment as the sole determinant in hiring teachers. Meanwhile, in the growing field of special education there were demands from parents and policymakers for increased professional training to meet the complex needs of children diagnosed with learning disorders and other handicapping conditions. Through a series of national court decisions, the obligations of the public schools and the state legislatures that paid for them had been dramatically increased in the previous decade.

Governor George Deukmejian had sponsored or supported few initiatives during his tenure. In fact, his support in 1988 for SB 148, Senator Bergeson's teacher preparation reform bill, was an exception to the rule. As a conservative Republican, Deukmejian believed in keeping government contained and encouraging governmental entities to solve problems at the local level. Governor Wilson, a moderate Republican, had a different approach. He wanted to make government more responsive, to streamline state procedures and to bring about reforms in education systems. With budget authority for public education coalescing in Sacramento the stage was set for both the Governor and the Legislature to make public education a centerpiece of their respective agendas, and the Commission was to find itself involved in a number of state education reform efforts. Governor Wilson and legislative policymakers made efforts to address the inter-twined issues of educator supply and demand, alternative programs of preparation, increased standards for professional preparation, support for new teachers, enhanced accreditation practices, and alignment of new student content standards and subject matter preparation standards for teachers.

Governor Wilson and his Secretary of Education, former Senator Marion Bergeson, were supportive of the Commission's efforts to reform teacher education. They were particularly instrumental in expanding "alternative routes" into teaching. Intern programs flourished under Wilson, who welcomed an alternative to conventional university programs for mature professionals who were willing to change careers. Wilson even approached Commission Chair Jerilyn Harris with a request that the CTC establish an Aerospace and Defense Workers Training Corps to respond to the "down-sizing" occurring in aerospace and the military. The Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA) was fully funded under

Governor Wilson. With intervention by Secretary Bergeson, BTSA funding was expanded to \$67.8 million during Wilson's tenure, assuring that all beginning teachers could experience support, assistance and continued preparation during their first two years of teaching. In addition, Governor Wilson initiated a multi-faceted, well-funded, statewide reading initiative. However, the most sweeping initiative enacted by Wilson, and the one that would have the most far-reaching implications for education in California, was the class-size reduction program established in 1996.

Class Size Reduction

The California Teachers Association had waged a full-scale media campaign, airing television commercials showing California public school children in large, over-crowded classrooms and challenging Governor Wilson to lower class sizes. The dismal scores of many California children on reading assessments had cast teachers in a bad light and research was beginning to emerge showing that lower class sizes could have an impact on student achievement. Research indicated that lowering the student-teacher ratio to below 17 to 1 was most effective, especially for the lowest achieving students.

The California Teachers Association, of course, was interested in increasing its membership. The Governor was interested in providing increased funding to all school districts while keeping extra funding "off the table"—not subject to local collective bargaining negotiations. The budget was showing a surplus. Late in the 1996 legislative session, Governor Wilson's administration proposed to earmark "surplus" funds for reduced class sizes. In a marathon of just a few weeks the Governor pushed through an initiative that would allow local districts to reduce class size in the early elementary grades.

Wilson's class size reduction program would become the most popular education initiative in California's history. Parents in suburban areas, deeply concerned about their children's ability to learn to read, welcomed class-size reduction as a way to provide all children with more personal instruction. Advocates for the poor held out the hope that reduced class sizes in urban schools would provide poor children with the extra help they needed to become successful readers. Despite its promise, however, the class size reduction program would result in the unintended consequences of increasing disparities between schools serving poor

students and schools with more affluent children, in particular, in access to fully credentialed teachers. According to the Public Policy Institute of California:

Class Size Reduction led to a dramatic increase in the percentages of inexperienced and uncertified teachers. In 1990, there were few differences in these characteristics by racial/ethnic and income groups. Even as late as 1995-1996, the year before Class Size Reduction, schools with high percentages of non-white and low-income students were only slightly more likely than other schools to have inexperienced teachers who lacked full certification and postgraduate schools. By 1999, large gaps in teacher qualifications had emerged between schools attended by nonwhite and low-income students and other schools. For black students in schools with more than 75 percent of the students enrolled in subsidized lunch programs, nearly 25 percent had a first- or second-year teacher; almost 30 percent had a teacher who was not fully certified. At the other extreme, for white students attending schools with 25 percent or fewer of the students enrolled in subsidized lunch programs, only 12 percent had a first- or second-year teacher, and only 5 percent had a teacher who was not fully credentialed. These differences reflect the varying levels of difficulty that many schools experienced in attempting to attract and retain teachers following the implementation of Class Size Reduction.

Ongoing shortages of special education, middle school and substitute teachers would haunt California for years to come. These shortages resulted in a perception among key Congressman, including George Miller Jr., that California refused to respond to the 1994 federal Education Act mandating a reduction in the achievement gap between poor children and their advantaged peers. This perception would lead to an even stronger set of mandates and sanctions when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was re-authorized in 2000. Ironically, Class Size Reduction resulted in significantly increased membership for Wilson's rival, the California Teachers Association.

Dramatic Increase in the Issuance of Emergency Permits

Pursuant to law, the Commission had issued emergency teaching documents for over twenty-five years. However, the 1996-97 *Annual Report on Emergency Permits and Credential Waivers* showed a dramatic increase in the issuance of both emergency permits and credential waivers. The unprecedented increase was due, for the most part, to California's effort to reduce class size in the primary grades. Approximately 11% of certificated staff in California's schools were employed on the basis of an emergency permit or a waiver as Class Size Reduction created an immediate need for over 18,000 new teachers to staff elementary classrooms. Other areas of teaching, such as middle schools and high schools, were impacted as teachers transferred to serve in the newly available smaller elementary classrooms. However, the most dramatic impact was seen in special education, as thousands of special education teachers "self-revoked" their credentials to take advantage of the opportunity to move into smaller regular education classrooms. A peripheral, but substantial, effect of class-size reduction was the drastic increase in the need for 30-Day Substitute Permit holders, as most substitutes were offered full-time employment.

Class Size Reduction and Teacher Fitness

Class size reduction had a largely unanticipated impact on ongoing efforts to protect California public school students from individuals who did not meet statutory requirements for teacher fitness. In the push to fill classrooms, many individuals who had been dismissed from school employment due to convictions for crimes of moral turpitude attempted to return to employment in the public schools. Commission workload increased in relation to the number of teachers needed. In particular, the work of the Division of Professional Practices--responsible for teacher fitness reviews--increased dramatically.

As a member of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) since 1987, the Commission has participated in the establishment and maintenance of a national teacher identification clearinghouse to exchange information on disciplinary action among participating states. The purpose of the clearinghouse has been to minimize the chances that persons whose certificates were revoked or suspended in one state could evade the system by receiving credentials in other states.

The Commission is mandated by California law to maintain a disciplinary review committee called the Committee of Credentials. The Committee is an investigatory body comprised of seven members appointed by the Commission for two-year terms. By law, the Committee is comprised of one elementary teacher, one secondary teacher, one school board member, one school administrator, and three public representatives. The Committee is required to review allegations of misconduct against a credential holder or applicant and make a recommendation to the Commission as to whether probable cause exists for adverse action against a credential holder or applicant. In certain situations where a holder or applicant has been convicted of a serious crime, such as a serious and violent felony or sex crimes involving children, the Committee has no discretion; the law requires that the credential be revoked or denied based on the nature of the crime committed.

It is fortunate that California was one of the first states to require fingerprinting for credential applicants and one of the first participants in the NASDTEC clearinghouse. The Commission experienced a substantial increase in disciplinary caseloads after fiscal year 1994. In the seven-year fiscal period of 1995-2002, following the enactment of the Class Size Reduction Program, the Commission revoked 1,159 credentials, suspended 357 credentials and issued 84 private admonitions. Complex case resolution increased 212 percent in four years--rising from 2,574 cases in 1995 to 5,460 in 1999—with no increase in legal staff during this time period. The law requires that these cases be investigated within a strict time period. Probation monitoring workload increased almost 30 percent, from 35 cases in 1997 to nearly 130 in 2000-01. Since the inception of the public reproof alternative in fiscal year 1995-96, 231 public reprovals were issued. In a similar seven-year period (fiscal year 1995-02), applicants were denied credentials in 492 cases.

Request for a Federal Approach to Information and Reporting

The Commission encouraged United States Secretary for Education Rod Paige to bring about greater uniformity in reporting teacher discipline cases. In a letter to Secretary Paige, Commission Chairman Alan Bersin contended that the absence of required reporting, and the lack of uniformity in existing reporting, causes harm. Meanwhile, a May 10, 2001 article in the *Pittsburgh Post Gazette* examined why sexually abusive teachers are not removed from

classrooms. The Gazette's three-part series on the issue concluded, "a small but dangerous contingent of sexual predators lurks among the dedicated teachers in our nation's classrooms." The Gazette examined 727 cases across the U.S. in which an educator has lost his or her license for sex offenses during the past five years, and "found some disturbing trends." Among the trends:

- The number of teachers who have lost their licenses because of sex offenses increased nearly 80 percent since 1994.
- Several of those who lost their licenses were caught only after they had been molesting students for many years.
- Offending teachers sometimes get help landing another teacher job from an unexpected source—their former bosses. The practice is so well-known among educators that they refer to it by name. They call it "passing the trash."
- Individual state aggressiveness in detecting and removing predators from the classroom varies widely, and some states do no background checks on teacher applicants at all.
- Even when caught, offending teachers can launch appeals that allow them to retain their teaching certificate for two to three more years.

"The present situation calls out dramatically for a federal approach to remedying the gaps in information and reporting that exist," wrote the Commission Chairman to Secretary Paige. "I believe you will agree that the current level of risk is unacceptable." The Commission's letter included draft language for a federal statute based upon the credential background checks and monitoring conducted in California. Chairman Bersin never received a response to his letter.

Margett and Scott Measures Strengthen Fitness Mandates

The Commission's mandates with respect to educator misconduct were revised and strengthened by several measures, including AB 1067 (Margett, 1999), AB 457 (Scott, 1999) and SB 299 (Scott, 2001). At the request of the Commission, Assemblyman Margett carried AB 1067 to bring into conformity two sections of the Education Code dealing with "lewd and lascivious behavior." AB 1067 also required the Commission to immediately revoke the credential of, or deny an application from, any individual who engaged in specified offenses, including assault against a child in his or her custody who is under the age of eight. Mr. Scott's AB 457 added to the list of sex offenses leading to mandatory credential revocation crimes involving the sale, distribution or publication via the internet of obscene and pornographic material. This Scott measure also required the Commission to revoke the credential of any person convicted of a violent or serious felony or a specified sex or drug offense. Finally, AB 457 prohibited a county board of education from issuing a temporary certificate to any applicant whose teaching credential had been revoked or suspended. The second Scott measure ensures that credential holders convicted of federal sex offenses are immediately removed from the classroom.

The Michelle Montoya Act

The most sweeping employee discipline measure was enacted in response to tragedy at a Sacramento high school in Sacramento. In 1997, a classified school employee savagely murdered student Michelle Montoya at her school. School district administrators, who had only recently hired the employee, were unaware of the man's history of violence. Following a highly emotional set of legislative hearings, the Michelle Montoya Act (AB 1612, Alby, 1997) was signed into law, banning any individual convicted of a violent or serious felony from working in a California public school. The ban applies to both credentialed and classified school employee positions; the only exemption allowing a convicted felon to pursue employment when he or she obtains a certificate of rehabilitation from the courts and a pardon from the Governor.

In follow-up to the Michelle Montoya Act, Assembly Members Alby and Ortiz co-authored a measure requiring all candidates for school employment and others who may come in contact

with students to undergo a background check prior to employment. AB 2102 (1998) added to credential candidate screening already underway by the Commission local employment fingerprint screening that included certificated and classified employees as well as outside employees who work on a school campus. Commission staff actively assisted Ms. Alby and Ms. Ortiz to craft the proposal and testified repeatedly in favor of the measure. As a result of Michelle Montoya's tragic death, California public school students and their parents are now assured that school employees meet a high standard of fitness.

Dr. Sam Swofford is appointed Executive Director of the Commission

Since its creation in 1970, the Commission had, by 1995, employed five chief administrators. Two of these individuals, George Gustafson and John Y. Brown, served relatively short terms while the other three, Peter LoPresti, Richard Mastain, and Philip Fitch each served for over five years. As the chief administrative officer of the Commission, the Executive Director served at the pleasure of the Commission and could be removed from the position by a majority vote of Commissioners. Thus, each Executive Director has fifteen bosses, all but one of whom are gubernatorial appointees. Of the five chief administrators, only one, Richard Mastain, retired from the position. All of the others resigned from the position, each for differing reasons. In the case of Fitch, who had replaced Mastain in 1990, the resignation came after a time of increasing pressure from members of the Governor Wilson's Office.

On April 1, 1996, Commission Chair Verna Dauterive announced the appointment of Dr. Sam Swofford as Executive Director of the Commission. Dr. Swofford had served as a public school teacher, administrator, and superintendent in California; he had over twenty years of experience in curriculum, personnel, and labor relations. Dr. Swofford already was familiar with the work of the Commission, since he had served on the Committee on Credentials, the statutorily mandated standing committee that deals with educator discipline. His familiarity with California educational issues and with the work of the Commission made it possible for him to take charge quickly and effectively following his appointment.

One of the shifts that Dr. Swofford's appointment suggested was the increased visibility of the public school sector in the work of the Commission. Of the five Commission chief administrators, most had come with ties to higher education. The selection of Dr. Swofford

indicated that the Commission saw local school districts as an important constituency. In keeping with Governor Wilson's priorities, it was also an indication that the Commission wanted to make state certification procedures more responsive to the needs of candidates, schools and school districts.

One of Dr. Swofford's first initiatives was to engage the Commission in a state-mandated strategic planning process to produce a clear set of goals based on the Commission's legal mandates and mission. With the assistance of KPMG, a well-respected management-consulting firm, the Commission engaged in a series of discussions and reviews to arrive at a set of goals to capture the essential work of the Commission. The six goals were designed to:

1. promote education excellence in California schools;
2. improve coordination between Commissioners and staff in carrying out the Commission's duties, roles and responsibilities;
3. improve customer service provided by the Commission;
4. increase legislative involvement of the Commission on key issues relating to educators in California;
5. improve the Commission's communication with its stakeholders; and
6. work with schools of education, the Department of Education and school districts to assure quality teachers.

During his first years with the Commission Dr. Swofford assembled a new team of senior managers who focused on increasing the Commission's effectiveness in governmental relations; providing timely information about issues before the Commission to a wide variety of stakeholders; and improving customer service. Under the Commission's direction and in keeping with Governor Wilson's goals, Dr. Swofford provided analysis and advice that assisted the Commission to propose and implement reform in numerous programs and policies. In the process, Swofford restored the confidence of a wide variety of education constituency groups who had become disenchanted with the Commission.

Statewide Task Force on Teacher Recruitment

Dr. Swofford was appointed just a few months prior to the enactment of Governor Wilson's sweeping class size reduction initiative. As he began his service as Commission Executive Director, work was already underway to address concerns about teachers serving on emergency permits. The Commission and others, most notably former Senator Gary Hart, had been concerned about the number of California teachers serving on emergency permits even before enactment of California's class size reduction program. As Director of the California State University Institute for Educational Reform (IER), Hart had coordinated a 1995 study entitled *A State of Emergency: Emergency Teachers in the State of California*. At that time about 6,000 teachers were serving on emergency permits out of a total teaching population of about 130,000. The Institute study concluded:

Hardly a day goes by without demands by some educational or political leader for reform of our public school system. Public alarm over education has evoked many calls for higher standards for students over the past two decades, but over the same period, the employment of under-qualified, inexperienced teachers to fill classrooms has continued and even increased. While these individuals come to the classroom from a variety of experiences and with differing degrees of knowledge, they uniformly represent a lowering of standards to accommodate their incomplete qualifications. This erosion of teacher standards, particularly in California's urban areas and in challenging subject areas such as special education and math, must be stemmed if we hope to improve pupil achievement, particularly among our disadvantaged student population.

Policymakers will have to consider key factors such as enrollment growth, inadequate salaries, difficult working conditions, unavailability of classes needed to earn teaching credentials, and shortages of teachers trained in key academic disciplines as they work to reduce the frequency with which California hires emergency teachers. And reduce it they must, because today, in many schools with the highest concentrations of at-risk students, and in some of the fields with the greatest bearing on California's economic future,

we are too frequently hiring under-prepared, under-qualified people to teach our children.

In early 1996, in response to the Institute for Education Reform study as well as its own growing concerns, the Commission convened a Statewide Task Force on Teacher Recruitment. Linda Bond, Commission Consultant, and Sue Burr, Associate Director of the California State University Institute for Education Reform, facilitated the work of the Task Force. Exceptional research and staff support was provided by Recruiting New Teachers, a Massachusetts based, foundation-supported entity that specialized in strategies to attract and retain teachers to low-performing schools. The group was comprised of representatives of classroom teachers, site and district administrators, local school boards, colleges and universities, state education agencies and education professional organizations.

Task Force recommendations, reported in *Shaping the Profession that Shapes California's Future: The California Statewide Teacher Recruitment Action Plan*, addressed three strategic areas in teacher recruitment and retention:

- *Expanding the pool* of prospective teachers;
- *Strengthening the pipeline* into teaching; and
- *Removing unnecessary barriers* to teaching careers by changing laws, policies and procedures governing state programs.

Recruiting New Teachers estimated that between 1996 and 2006, California would need to hire 250,000 to 300,000 new teachers due to increases in student enrollment, a large number of retirements in the teacher workforce, and accelerated demand for teachers to implement the popular Class Size Reduction Program. At the same time, research by Professor Linda Darling-Hammond and others clearly demonstrated the importance of teacher qualifications, including attention to both pedagogy and subject matter preparation, in improving student achievement.

By 1998, through a coordinated series of legislative efforts and budget appropriations, virtually all of the key recommendations of the Statewide Task Force on Teacher Recruitment had become a reality. A coalition headed by Sue Burr including the

Commission, teacher associations, the school administrators association, universities and local school districts, lobbied legislators and the Governor, who responded with unprecedented, comprehensive support:

Strengthening the Pipeline

- The California Center for Teaching Careers (CalTeach) was created as a result of SB 824 (Leroy Greene). In the closing moments of the 1997 Legislative Session, the coalition and Senator Greene overcame a last minute effort by the Senate Republican Caucus to kill the measure. CalTeach's primary charge was to recruit qualified individuals to the teaching profession. It was responsible for advertising the need for teachers, the requirements for obtaining a teaching credential and admission requirements for entrance into a conventional or alternative teacher preparation program. SB 824 also called for creation and expansion of a referral database for qualified teachers seeking employment in public schools.
- The 1998-99 Budget Act provided the University of California with \$1.5 million to support prospective teachers in the areas of mathematics and science. It provided stipends to juniors and seniors majoring in math, science, and engineering willing to work in local public schools as teaching interns.

Expanding the Pool

- The capacity of institutions of higher education and local school districts to prepare teachers was enhanced by an increase in funding for the California State University, which was specifically earmarked for teacher preparation.

- District and university internship programs received a substantial increase, from 6.5 million to \$11 million, to prepare up to 7,300 interns in 1998.
- The “Cal T” grant program was created to cover the cost of teacher preparation for candidates who needed financial assistance (to stay in school, rather than obtain an emergency permit); the Assumption Program of Loans for Educators (created earlier by Hart legislation) was increased from 400 to 4,500 awards.

In a complementary effort, the Commission sponsored legislation in 1997 (AB 351, Scott) to create the Pre-Intern Teacher Training Program. The Scott bill called for strengthened support, assistance and advising for emergency permit teachers to enhance their performance while increasing the likelihood that these individuals would remain in teaching. Omnibus teacher preparation reform legislation, SB 2042 (Alpert, Mazzoni, 1998), replaced outmoded requirements (such as a “fifth year” of postgraduate coursework and separate courses in health, mainstreaming and computers) with preparation shown to be more effective (such as teacher induction). SB 2042 also called on institutions of higher education to provide for “blended programs” of theory and practice that could be completed along with undergraduate coursework. Governor Wilson was particularly supportive of this “fast track” to teaching which was modeled on successful programs in other states.

Removing Barriers: The Ongoing Partnership with Assemblyman Jack Scott

The Commission was fortunate to develop a partnership for reform with Assemblyman Jack Scott. The relationship with Assemblyman Scott began in 1997 and continued through the ensuing years as Scott, former president of a community college whose genteel manner belied consummate strength and ability as a legislator, brought singular dedication to removing unnecessary barriers to teaching. Spurred on by concerns expressed by his daughter, an out-of-state prepared teacher, Scott agreed to carry legislation to attract and retain much-needed teachers to California schools. Thus, AB 1620 (Scott, 1998) required the Commission determine whether credential “reciprocity” could be established with other states.

Dr. Swofford encouraged Commission staff to respond to what practitioners, policymakers and researchers perceived as burdensome, unnecessary barriers to certification for educators who were prepared in other states. Assemblyman Scott's AB 1620, sponsored by the Commission under Dr. Swofford's leadership, required the CTC to review teacher preparation programs and standards in other states and establish reciprocity with states that had comparable standards and requirements. Former Commission Executive Director Phil Fitch, then serving as a Commission Consultant, directed the multi-faceted review. It was assumed by many at the time that California was unique in its comprehensive teacher preparation standards. This was undoubtedly true in the 1950's, when California led the way to require subject matter preparation for all teachers. However, the study required by the Scott bill showed that in the nationwide push for high standards following publication of *A Nation At Risk*, numerous other states upgraded their teacher preparation requirements. When the work required by the Scott bill was completed, over 37 states were shown to have teacher preparation requirements that were comparable to California's. In a welcome move for teachers credentialed and experienced in other states, Scott's urgency measure also exempted from specified California requirements teachers prepared in other states who successfully completed at least three years of full-time classroom experience, as demonstrated by written performance reviews.

Scott wasn't shy about prodding the Commission toward reform when he thought it was warranted. For example, he participated in a meeting with other authors of Commission-sponsored legislation--Senator Alpert and Assemblywoman Mazzoni—where the Commission was challenged to rethink policies governing regional accreditation. The law at that time recognized accrediting decisions by the Western Association Schools and Colleges (WASC), but not duly constituted regional accrediting bodies in other sections of the country. Representatives of private universities based outside of California encouraged Scott, Alpert and Mazzoni to work with the Commission to eliminate a perceived barrier to locating satellite campuses in California—schools that could assist in preparing teachers for California classrooms. Scott and the others considered this a reasonable solution to an arbitrary roadblock. As a university faculty member Scott had participated in regional accreditation reviews in California and elsewhere. Based upon this experience Scott

contended that the standards governing regional accreditation in other parts of the United States were comparable to standards used by WASC.

In response to this nudge from Scott and others the Commission conducted a study of standards governing regional accrediting regional agencies across the country. Dr. Dennis Tierney, a Commission administrator and former CSU faculty member, conducted the review. Tierney reported to the Commission that there were few differences in the requirements established by the various accrediting associations or in the procedures they used to render accreditation decisions. Based upon this study, Assemblywoman Mazzoni and Assemblyman Scott successfully carried legislation (AB 2730, 1998) to eliminate the requirement that all teacher preparation programs approved in California be accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). Instead, the law now mandates that all such programs be regionally accredited.

Mr. Scott was committed to ensuring that every California student had access to a qualified teacher. In 1999 he successfully authored AB 471, sponsored by the Commission. This measure required the Commission to report annually to the legislature and governor on the number instructors holding emergency permits. AB 471 established a “hiring hierarchy” by requiring school districts to make a concerted effort to recruit and hire teachers who hold the appropriate credentials for their teaching assignments. Districts were allowed to hire intern teachers only after they had made a reasonable effort to hire fully credentialed instructors. The holder of an emergency permit or waiver could be hired only as a last resort. In addition, AB 471 expanded data collection and reporting to provide state and local policy makers with better information on the scope, extent and nature of teacher shortages in specific regions, types of schools, and subjects. Dr. Swofford wrote to Governor Wilson to request his signature on AB 471, suggesting that better information on shortage areas could be of use to state policy makers in answering key questions, including:

- In what counties, districts, subjects, and credential areas are shortages continuing?
- What are the projections for shortages in the future?

- What state policies and programs seem to be particularly effective in addressing the issues of teacher recruitment and retention?
- Are additional policies needed to address particularly acute or continuing shortages, such as shortages in rural areas, urban districts, in special education, or math and science?

In a related effort based on Senator Scott's measures, Commission staff prepared a list of school districts with more than 50 employees that had, for four years or more, employed 20% or more of their teaching staff on emergency permits. Twenty-nine school districts were placed on the list. On January 4, 2002, Dr. Swofford sent a letter to each district explaining the recruitment requirements in the Scott measures and requesting completion of a survey regarding the districts' recruitment policies, use of alternative certification programs, and recruitment methods. The survey showed that use of the pre-intern and intern programs was almost universal among those districts. The districts indicated that they also were working with the Teacher Recruitment Centers and were attending job fairs.

The Commission offered a workshop to the selected districts in May of 2002, focusing on ways to reduce dependence on emergency permit teachers. The Commission presented findings from the Transition to Teach pilot project operating in San Diego and Oakland. In addition, Pasadena Unified School District presented information on the methods they had used to decrease emergency permit hires by five percent. Mr. Scott's efforts appear to have been helpful. Out of 22 districts subsequently audited, data show that all of the districts reduced emergency permits, one district by as much as 82%. Eighteen of the 22 districts were below the 20% threshold.

Mr. Scott continued to carry legislation to streamline and eliminate unnecessary barriers to teaching. In 2000 he successfully authored legislation to build on the "reciprocity" statute by moving to a system based on equivalent preparation. As the teacher shortage in California became more apparent, legislators viewed the need for formal reciprocity agreements with other states as unnecessary. The California Teachers Association, which had called for state by state reciprocity agreements in the first Scott measure, agreed that other states should not be allowed maintain barriers by rejecting an reciprocity agreement. Under Assembly Bill

877 (Scott and O'Connell, Chapter 703, Statutes of 2000) requirements for experienced private school teachers also were removed. A teacher preparation program is waived entirely for teachers with six years of successful experience in a private school. For teachers with three years of successful private school teaching, student teaching requirements are waived. "California faces a shortage of qualified teachers and administrators, particularly in our urban and rural schools," Assembly Member Scott said. "We need to continue to reduce unnecessary barriers for qualified teachers and administrators willing to come to California. Senator O'Connell added, "This move will not only aid recruiters in offering a clear description of California credentialing, but will reduce red tape and clean up a needlessly complex credentialing process."

Mr. Scott was subsequently elected to the Senate. A letter to the Senator, copied to the Commission, crystallized the thoughts and feelings of many regarding his work to streamline credential requirements for experienced teachers:

I am writing to let you know my deepest appreciation for your recent legislation that changed the way out of state teachers are certified in the state of California. I have been a teacher of the deaf and hard of hearing for over 20 years. I hold an undergraduate degree from the University of Tennessee and a graduate degree from the University of Texas. I have taught in five states and also for the Department of Defense. I moved to California two years ago with my husband due to a job transfer. I was totally dismayed to find out I must return to college to attend a credential program. Senator Scott, I do not know how you became involved in changing the credentialing process but I am writing you my story so you will know you have deeply affected at least one teacher in this state. Many times I said to my husband in the past year that I would just quit ...and give up my career of 20 years. I appreciate so very much your commitment to this bill and to supporting out of state teachers. My family and I wish to thank you from the bottom of our hearts for making such an impact on our lives.

Mazzoni Legislation

Other legislators were not as successful as Mr. Scott was in gaining a Governor's signature on Commission-sponsored legislation. Governor Davis vetoed two bills carried by Assemblywoman Kerry Mazzoni. AB 309, which would have made it easier for school districts in California to provide an administrator preparation program modeled after the statewide teacher internship program, was vetoed in response to opposition from the Department of Finance. This measure would have expressed Legislative findings regarding the shortage of administrators, particularly in hard to staff schools. It would have authorized local education agencies or regionally accredited colleges or universities to establish an alternative certification program that met specified Commission standards for content and a supervised practicum, and allow the Commission to award incentive grants to qualifying sponsors. The Department of Finance contended that the measure was not specific enough with respect to the content of the proposed administrator internship programs. Finance also knew that Governor Davis wanted to sponsor subsequent legislation in the area of administrator preparation.

AB 2339 by Assemblywoman Mazzoni was vetoed as well. AB 2339 would have tied continuing accreditation of teacher preparation programs to the performance of their students. Preparation programs would continue to be accredited by the state only if their credential candidates had performed well in real-world classroom settings and on the state exam on the teaching of reading. The teacher preparation programs also would be judged on how many of their graduates went on to teach, and how graduates, parents and fellow teachers viewed the effectiveness of the training the graduate had received. In addition, AB 2339 would have increased the frequency with which teacher "misassignments" were monitored by the state. Characterized by one author as the "dirty little secret of U.S. education," misassignments are cause for concern, since misassigned teachers are not prepared in the subjects they were assigned to teach. The Commission and Assemblywoman Mazzoni argued that "the state continues to receive complaints from the public, classroom teachers, districts and county offices about the possible misassignments of teachers." County Offices of education are responsible for tracking and reporting such misassignments, however, the Commission argued, "county offices are under-funded for this purpose." "To provide better accountability," Mazzoni contended, "AB 2339 would authorize more extensive follow-up on

complaints regarding misassignments, along with adequate funding for counties to comply with current statutes on misassignment monitoring.” “Continued, willful, illegal assignment of teachers would result in sanctions against a school district,” Mazzoni concluded.

There was no opposition to the Mazzoni measure. However, for reasons of cost, the Department of Finance proposed a veto of AB 2339, and Governor Davis took Finance’s advice. Ironically, a settlement agreement in response to a lawsuit against the state resulted in a monitoring system similar to the one Mazzoni and the Commission proposed, but at a substantially higher cost to the state.

Governor Wilson and the Legislature Expand BTSA

As Assembly Education Committee Chair, Mazzoni was successful in carrying a measure that complemented Governor Wilson’s efforts to expand the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program. The Governor’s proposed 1997-98 Budget contained an appropriation to expand the BTSA program by \$10 million, for a total appropriation of \$17.5 million. Assemblywoman Mazzoni’s AB 1266 called on the Superintendent of Public Instruction to develop a funding expansion plan for BTSA and declared Legislative intent to provide funding sufficient to serve all participating beginning teachers by the year 2000. The bill also clarified the definition of “beginning teacher” to insure that first and second year teachers who had completed their preliminary credential program were the ones to benefit from the beginning teacher support initiative. AB 1266 moved the preparation system away from “seat-time” to a standards-based approach allowing a candidate who had met the standards for a preliminary credential to move directly into an induction program. This provision was particularly welcome to the Los Angeles Unified School District Internship Program, which wanted to expeditiously transition interns who were ready to move to a district-run induction program.

Governor Wilson’s California Reading Initiative

Governor Wilson’s education initiatives were not limited to class size reduction and beginning teacher support. Under Wilson’s leadership California made a major commitment to improve the reading skills of all public school students. The Governor’s *California*

Reading Initiative, enacted by the "ABC" bills (Assembly Bill 170 and 1504 of 1995) required the State Board of Education to adopt materials in grades 1-8 that included "systematic, explicit phonics, spelling, and basic computational skills." AB 3482 of 1996 provided funding to support staff development for certificated teachers of pupils in kindergarten and grades 1 through 3. Budget appropriations provided for new, research-based reading instructional materials to all primary grade students. Other new statutes specified the content of pre-service preparation in reading instruction for all teacher candidates, requiring the Commission to develop and implement a new reading standard. Finally, AB 1178 (Cuneen, 1996) called on the Commission to develop and administer a Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) at the "earliest feasible date" and to "certify that all . . . teacher education programs . . . offer instruction in the knowledge, skills and abilities that are required by the RICA Assessment." Passage of this new reading assessment became a requirement for all California applicants for Multiple Subject Credentials beginning October 1, 1998.

The reading initiative arose from compelling data showing declining performance among California public school students. A convergence of research demonstrated that a systematic approach to reading was effective in developing reading proficiency, particularly among young students. In particular, a major series of research studies directed by G. Reid Lyon of the National Institutes of Child, Health, and Human Development (NICHD) examined features that predispose children to having reading disabilities, concluding that the most significant problem appears to be phonological processing. For these students, without systematic and explicit instruction in the alphabetic code system, reading becomes a guessing game. The NICHD studies identified the best strategies to use with these children:

- Explicit work to help children understand the sound structure of the language ("phonemic awareness," understanding that letters represent sounds);
- Intensive and explicit work in sound/symbol associations, ranging from thirty minutes day, five days a week to one hour at a time in a 1:1 tutorial; and
- Explicit application to connected text with controlled vocabulary.

Furthermore, the NICHD research demonstrated that interventions with struggling readers must begin early. The research showed that if schools delay intervention until age seven for

children experiencing difficulty, 75 percent will continue having reading difficulties. These NICHD studies echoed research by Professor Barbara Foorman of the University of Houston, which demonstrated that dyslexic problems, if caught in first or second grade, might be remedied 82 percent of the time. Problems caught during grades three to five may be improved 46 percent of the time, while those identified later may only be treated successfully 10-15 percent of the time.

In 1996, the California Education Policy Seminar (CEPS) and the California State University Institute for Education Reform (IER), with the assistance of the Consortium on Reading Excellence (CPRE), published a report entitled *Building A Powerful Reading Program: From Research to Practice*. The report summarized the highly replicated longitudinal research from the National Institutes of Health as well as a federally commissioned analysis of reading research completed over more than a decade. Marilyn Adams, Ph.D., Senior Scientist, Bolt Beranek and Newman, Inc., Hallie Yopp, Professor, Department of Elementary and Bilingual Education, California State University, Fullerton, and David Pearson, Professor of Education at Michigan State University offered presentations to policy makers and practitioners at a February 1996 seminar led by Gary Hart. The CEPS/IER report summarized the research, concluding that a systematic approach to teaching reading has two critical elements:

- Teaching the system of language, and
- Linking instruction in a logical, sequenced progression throughout the grades.

The researchers stressed that any such systematic approach “should not be a return to dull drills and rote learning in classrooms devoid of engaging literature but rather be part of a broader language-rich program.” They also suggested that teacher education include an “understanding of how the English language system works, how students learn to read, and state-of-the-art best practices.” The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Walter S. Johnson Foundation, the Pacific Telesis Foundation, the Pioneer Fund, the Walter and Elise Haas Fund, the Weingart Foundation and the Stuart Foundations funded the CEPS/IER report. In addition to summarizing key research findings the report, distributed statewide, provided detailed “recommendations for the field” based upon successful early reading programs, and “recommendations for the use of state discretionary dollars.”

Following publication of the CEPS/IER report, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, the California State Board of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction produced a reading program advisory, *Teaching Reading; A Balanced, Comprehensive Approach to Teaching Reading in Prekindergarten Through Grade Three*. The advisory provided much needed information about the components of an effective reading program, expectations and examples of classroom practices, and information on instructional guidance and support. Carol Katzman, a former reading teacher who represented Superintendent Delaine Eastin on the Commission, was particularly helpful in building a working relationship between the Department of Education and the Commission with respect to reading instruction.

The Governor and legislative policymakers knew that if Governor Wilson's *California Reading Initiative* was to succeed, it was essential that preparation of K-12 teachers be aligned with the comprehensive approach to reading instruction that was now a mandate for every student's education. When the *California Reading Initiative* was being formulated, the Commission signaled its support of the initiative and its intent to exert strong leadership for teacher education reforms.

(A three-year longitudinal study released in 2003 by the national Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation showed that California's emphasis on teacher preparation during the Wilson administration apparently was well placed. *Prepared to Make a Difference*, touted as the first longitudinal study to document the specific elements of effective pre-service programs in reading, concluded, "Teachers, not the instructional method or the materials, are crucial to promoting student learning." The report demonstrated that "new elementary school teachers who were well-prepared in pre-service programs to teach reading expressed greater confidence in their knowledge and skills, fostered richer literacy environments in their classrooms, and helped their pupils achieve higher levels of reaching comprehension than did other teachers.")

The "Unz Initiative"

On June 2, 1998, California voters enacted Proposition 227, a ballot initiative entitled "English for the Children," to govern the K-12 education of the 1.4 million students in

California public schools who are not native speakers of English. The initiative directed that “all children in California public schools shall be taught English as rapidly and effectively as possible.” In particular, the initiative specified that “all children shall be placed in English language classrooms” unless parents specifically requested that their child be taught English and other subjects through bilingual education techniques.

Proposition 227 was unprecedented in its specificity in directing education practice. Also unprecedented was a California ballot initiative conceived, promoted and funded by a single wealthy individual. Ron Unz was the first multi-millionaire to promote a statewide ballot campaign in California but he would not be the last. In fact, although Californians tended to reject wealthy individuals running for statewide elective office, the role of wealthy individuals in public policy decisions reached a new and controversial high as such individuals sponsored statewide initiatives and eventually, a recall election bringing down a Governor.

On July 9, 1998, the State Board of Education adopted a set of emergency regulations for implementing Proposition 227. The regulations were amended twice by the Board, and the Department of Education developed a program advisory entitled *State Program for English Learners* (September, 1998). The advisory was based on federal requirements with respect to English learners, Proposition 227 requirements, other California Education Code requirements, and the regulations of the State Board of Education.

Preparing Teachers in English Language Development

Although the Unz initiative did not mandate specific requirements for teacher preparation, it was incumbent upon state policymakers to ensure that teachers of English language learners had the requisite skills, knowledge and abilities to assist these students to master English while also learning core subject matter. The Commission proceeded to address this imperative, as well as Governor Wilson’s initiatives on reading, via its response to Senate Bill 2042 (Alpert and Mazzoni, 1998). During SB 2042 implementation a new reading standard was applied to all programs leading to a Multiple Subjects Credential, including teacher preparation programs preparing teachers for English language learners.

The Commission played a role in the enactment of legislation by Assemblywoman Denise Ducheny (AB 1059/1999) to ensure all new teachers would be well versed in English language development. In addition, the Commission assisted representatives of teachers in supporting legislation (SB 395/1999, Hughes) to ensure that experienced teachers would have appropriate development opportunities to acquire the skills they needed to assist English learners to maintain their academic progress.

SB 395, sponsored by the California Teachers Association, extended the opportunity for experienced teachers to complete specified professional development in English language development to serve English language learners in core academic subjects such as math, science and history (from January 1, 2000 to January 1, 2005). An earlier measure by Senator Hughes, (SB 1969, 1994) permitted school districts, county offices of education, colleges, universities, and professional organizations, until January 1, 2000, to provide staff development programs that prepare teachers for assignments teaching English learners. The professional development was in lieu of the requirement to complete a university-based program of courses leading to a separate, English language instruction (CLAD) certificate. Instead of relying on local approval processes, however, SB 395 required that the Commission review and approve all such professional development programs based upon statewide standards. The bill also insured that statewide standards would integrate preparation in English language development with preparation in research-based reading instruction.

Legislative debate over SB 395 was contentious, with some legislators expressing concern the SB 395 requirements would be weaker than the existing certificate requirements. These policymakers also were concerned that extending the deadline for completion of required training would erode accountability for insuring that teachers participated in the statutorily-mandated work in a timely manner. The Commission lent its support to SB 395 after the bill was amended to insure that all candidates would meet state level requirements for targeted professional development, and that such standards would be aligned with standards on reading preparation.

Assemblywoman Ducheny's measure (AB 1059, 1999) prohibits the Commission, starting July 1, 2003, from issuing a preliminary teaching credential to any applicant who has not met

standards for teaching English language learners. The law also prohibits the Commission, starting July 1, 2005, from initially issuing a professional clear teaching credential to an applicant unless the applicant has satisfied state standards for teaching English language learners. Such standards can be satisfied either as part of an approved beginning teacher induction program or by obtaining a state authorization to teach English language learners. The measure also mandated that the Commission develop a test for teachers to demonstrate fulfillment of the new requirements. The testing option was to be made available to all candidates, but was aimed at providing a viable option for those teachers who were trained in other states.

If SB 395 was contentious, AB 1059 was more so. Assemblywoman Ducheny was passionate that all teachers in California should know how to assist the increasingly larger number of students who were struggling to learn English. She was particularly sensitive to the challenge of assisting these students as they were moved from specialized classes to mainstream instruction as a result of Proposition 227. Meanwhile, the California Teachers Association was adamantly opposed to new credential requirements, particularly new requirements for existing teachers. Proposition 227 had passed by a large margin, and the Governor had concerns about the effectiveness of bilingual education, thus Governor Davis did not look favorably on adding new requirements to govern instruction for English language learners. However, the Governor and his staff were committed to revising all state credentialing requirements to align with new, research-based standards on the teaching of reading.

As the Ducheny measure moved through the Legislature a compromise was eventually fashioned with the help of Commission governmental relations staff. As part of the reforms provided by SB 2042 (Bergeson/Mazzoni) new standards would ensure that all newly credentialed teachers would be prepared to assist students to maintain access to the curriculum. These standards would target the need to prepare teachers in English language development; new credentials would not be developed. Most importantly from the Governor's standpoint, using the SB 2042 reform process the Commission would insure that any standards governing English language development would be aligned with research-based standards governing the teaching of reading.

Reform in Special Education Standards and Preparation

In the 1990s the Commission determined that over the course of the previous twenty-five years, special education statutes and regulations had been enacted in a well-intentioned but piecemeal fashion. As a result, special education credentials existed in a structure that neither lacked internal coherence nor was congruent with the changing needs of California students. Given Governor Wilson's desire to make state programs more responsive to the needs of students and school districts, the Commission set about to reform the special education credential structure. In keeping with other reforms in the 1990s, the Commission redesigned its policies to review preparation programs on the basis of standards that relate to significant aspect of the quality of those programs. Even more significantly, in adopting a new credential structure in 1993 the Commission combined the requirements for a specialist credential in special education with the requirements for a Multiple Subjects Elementary teaching credential. This redesign was meant to eliminate the overlap in preparation that occurred under the prior structure, which mandated that special educators first complete all requirements for a basic credential, then all requirements for a special education credential. Finally, the credential redesign called for a "two-tiered" structure, with coursework in subject matter and pedagogy required for the first tier, and a beginning teacher support program provided as part of the second tier.

In developing the new credential structure and standards, a Special Education Advisory Panel and the Commission considered the widespread shortages of qualified teachers for special education assignments. New standards for the professional level credential were developed to include support and mentoring expectations that the Advisory Panel believed would increase the retention of new special education teachers. This expectation was based upon evaluation studies of the California New Teacher Project, sponsored by the Commission and the State Department of Education. The Advisory Panel and the Commission believed that two phases of training were important because special education professionals were increasingly being expected to act as consultants to general education teachers and other practitioners in mainstream settings.

Special Education Teacher Internships

In 1994 the Los Angeles Unified School District sponsored Senate Bill 1657 (Hughes) to allow local school districts to provide special education internships, in addition to internships in regular education. Like other districts Los Angeles Unified, was experiencing a shortage of qualified special education teachers. During the late 1980s and the 1990s data from the Commission and the California Department of Education confirmed a serious shortage of special education teachers in California. During the 1994-95 school year, nearly 5,000 less-than-fully-qualified persons were teaching in special education classes in the public schools while holding emergency permits and waivers. In the same year, new Special Education Specialist Credentials were issued to only 2,176 teachers. Of the 45 California institutions that prepared special education teachers in 1994-95, 13 offered internships to candidates who planned to teach in special education. When the legislation by Senator Hughes was introduced, universities and colleges expressed concern that local school districts may not have the expertise to provide for special education preparation, and they opposed the bill. As the legislation advanced a compromise was reached. The Los Angeles Unified School District was authorized to establish a special education internship program on a pilot basis, the only district so authorized. The Commission was to review the success of the program and report to the Legislature prior to any statewide approach to special education internships. The Hughes bill became Chapter 673 of the Statutes of 1994.

Growth of Teacher Internship Programs During the Wilson Administration

The primary purpose of internship programs is to enable candidates who have completed all requirements in the subject they are assigned to teach, along with an intensive 120 hour pre-service program, to provide a full range of professional services while they complete remaining requirements in teaching methodology. Internships may be particularly suitable for “career changers,” individuals with expertise in a subject matter area who have professional experience in the subject, and who are capable of assuming complex responsibilities at an accelerated pace. Many individuals who would not otherwise enter teaching, because they are not in a position to forego income while they complete a conventional university-based preparation program, come into teaching through an internship program.

The District Intern Program was created under SB 813 (Hart and Hughes), the 1983 comprehensive school finance and education measure. When SB 813 (Hart) and AB 70 (Hughes) were before a Joint Legislative Conference Committee, Assemblywoman Hughes had argued persuasively that district-based internships should be available to potential teachers, especially in districts with teacher shortages such as Los Angeles. Assemblywoman Hughes wanted to allow districts to develop programs that directly addressed the needs of their students, such as preparing teachers for schools in low-income, urban districts. She also wanted to provide an additional path into the teaching profession for persons whose life experiences and maturity make them particularly suited for alternative preparation through on-the-job training coupled with intensive seminars. Under the Hughes proposal, district internships would last two years (as opposed to one-year university internships). These provisions enacted as part of SB 813, the Hughes-Hart Education Reform Act required the Commission to grant a teaching credential to those who completed a district internship program; however, the Commission was expressly prohibited from approving or accrediting the district internship programs. The 1983 Education Reform Act mandated a report to the Legislature by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to determine if the District Internship Program was meeting its statutory goals. The Commission fulfilled this mandate in 1987 and again in 1995.

The 1987 report was based on the results of written questionnaires and oral interviews with more than 200 interns, mentor teachers, district and site-level administrators, instructors, and others connected with district intern programs. Twelve trained assessors observed the performance of teacher interns in their second year of service, a matched set of second year teachers who had completed traditional teacher preparation programs, and another matched group of second-year emergency permit holders. Using an observation system that examined six performance measures, more than four hundred observations of classroom activities were the basis for the Commission's findings and recommendations. It was clear from the 1987 study that many smaller districts were having trouble sustaining their district internship programs.

The 1995 internship study by the Commission examined a decade of data. Demographic data indicated that district intern programs provided a method to diversify the teaching workforce.

Those under-represented in the teaching force were well represented in district internship programs. Data showed that programs at urban sites were better able to sustain themselves over time. Interns reported that there were areas where the curriculum needed to be improved, such as preparation in child and adolescent development and working with parents. Interns also reported that the formal “mentor” support system was not supplying the assistance at a level of intensity that would be beneficial. Most interns reported they had received adequate support from the formal “mentoring” system, as well as the informal system of help from other teachers at their grade level or department. However, 12% of interns reported that they had not had any contact with a mentor or other person formally assigned to them. Others reported that formal support was inadequate because their mentors were employed at schools some distance from their sites or taught subjects in different areas or grade levels than the interns. Nevertheless, interns and graduates of district intern programs reported “the strengths of their programs far outweighed the weaknesses.” There was high praise for the practicality, immediacy, and relevance of the coursework. Interns appreciated that experienced classroom teachers were teaching most of the courses in the program. Opportunities to interact with peers who were experiencing the same challenges and encountering the same frustrations were listed as important parts of learning to teach. School districts that sponsored district intern programs reported that they were able to retain those who successfully completed that two-year internship. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the respondents to the graduate questionnaire were still in the districts where they began, and most remained in the same “hard-to-staff” schools.

Governor Wilson’s Interest in Internships

Governor Wilson and his education advisors took an active interest in expanding internship programs as part of a statewide effort to create jobs for Californians. As a result of the Governor’s interest, Assembly Bill 1161 (Quackenbush, Chapter 1147, Statutes of 1993) was signed into law. The Quackenbush measure implemented some recommendations of the Commission’s 1992 report to the Legislature and for the first time, provided state funding for both district and university internship programs. AB 1161 required funding to be provided for alternative certification programs that address geographic or subject matter shortage areas. The measure mandated that internships be targeted toward people with work experience, such as those from business, industry, and the military services and others who

already have a Bachelor's Degree in the subject they would be assigned to teach. Governor Wilson, deeply concerned about "down-sizing" occurring both in the military and the California aerospace industry, signed state budgets in 1993-94 and 1994-95 including \$2 million from the General Fund to support the alternative preparation programs expanded by the Quackenbush bill. Since universities already received state support for teacher intern programs, the Quackenbush legislation specified only school districts or county offices of education could request funds for the creation or expansion of a District Intern Program. However, these local education agencies were encouraged to work collaboratively with colleges, universities, teacher associations, private businesses, defense-related industries, military services, and others to develop and implement internship programs. As a result of Governor Wilson's support for teacher internships:

- More than 1,400 teachers were placed in California's hardest-to-staff schools;
- 12 of 28 funded programs recruited from aerospace and defense-related industries, including the armed services;
- All 11 internship programs preparing teachers for secondary schools prepared teachers in mathematics and science;
- State-funded programs served students in 39 counties and 170 school districts (participating districts served more than 2 million California K-12 students); and
- Five of the new internship programs served rural areas, where shortages were often more acute than urban districts.

A Focus on Improving Teacher Preparation

Near the tenth anniversary of the release of the Commons Commission report, *Who Will Teach Our Children?*, former Senator Gary Hart convened a 1995 California Education Policy Seminar for over 30 educators, policymakers and researchers to review what had been learned about good teaching and effective teacher education over the previous ten years. Conference proceedings, entitled "Teachers and Teaching" concluded:

- Good teaching has been identified by research as the key to school success and school reform.
- Knowledge of effective teaching and teacher education has been expanded and

refined.

- What works and what doesn't work in teaching and teacher preparation can now be clearly defined.

The conferees described a new research-based model of effective teacher education including: a college curriculum built on knowledge of how children learn and develop; heavy emphasis on the content of academic subjects; extensive and intensively-supervised internships in schools; gradual assumption of responsibility for classroom teaching coupled with observations and assistance; and public accountability for quality control of training programs through adherence to common rigorous requirements, external reviews of program performance, and documentation of opportunities for teaching candidates to meet new standards of excellence in teacher education. The participants and researchers cautioned:

Alternate route programs that bypass conventional preparation have increased. Successful ones have carefully designed curricula focused on learning theory, subject matter content, internships linked to course matter, and gradual induction into classrooms with mentors. Unsuccessful ones are short-term, fail to cover essential knowledge, lack mentors, have high teacher dropout rates, and report lower student test scores.

The conferees suggested how California could best focus its efforts to improve teacher preparation:

- For greater public accountability, all teacher education programs should be evaluated against the new model of teaching effectiveness.
- Directors of teacher education programs should be asked to insure that current knowledge about effective teaching has been incorporated into the teacher training process.
- State policy on school improvement and reform should be shaped around teacher competence as the key to raising student achievement and enabling schools to cope with the greater diversity of students.

- Teacher education institutions and school districts should be required to develop and document a working relationship. The goal would be to promote an effective transfer of teaching theory into practice by new teachers.
- Public accountability measures, such as regular progress reports and external assessments, should be required to document that all teacher education programs are moving toward the new model of teaching effectiveness.

The conferees also recommended that policymakers be mindful to avoid:

- Withholding from the public the results of teacher training assessments since “public understanding of teacher training issues will provide important leverage for bringing about knowledge-based improvements.”
- Alternate-route programs that are short term, weak in research-based knowledge of teaching and in subject matter content, and are not designed to use mentors consistently.

With respect to the desirability of teacher induction, the conferees cautioned:

The trend is toward greater numbers of new teachers being introduced to classrooms through supervised internships or residencies in schools while still enrolled in teacher education programs. However, many new teachers still are not given sufficient support and are left to “sink or swim” in classrooms.

A Consensus on the Importance of Teacher Quality

An April 1999 report by *EdSource*, a foundation-supported research and information service, suggested that a drive to strengthen teacher quality in California was resulting from “the belief that all students should master a common set of skills and knowledge” based upon the K-12 academic content standards approved in 1997-98. *EdSource* claimed “an increasing

number of policy makers agreed that substantially improving student achievement would be impossible unless the issue of teacher quality was addressed.” The organization concluded,

A growing body of research and public opinion has reinforced the call for policy attention to teacher qualifications. Research shows that teacher quality, including teacher skills, certification, and education are important factors in determining student achievement. The public also sees teachers as a top priority, according to a 1998 Harris-conducted poll. The poll included a special focus on California commissioned by The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning. Almost 90% of the Californians polled said “ensuring a well-qualified teacher in every classroom” is crucial for lifting student achievement.

In the mid to late 1990s, a variety of California policy makers sought to focus attention on the link between teacher preparation standards and standards for students. These policy makers created the context for enactment and implementation of the comprehensive reforms in teacher education required by Senate Bill 2042.

The Comprehensive Review Leading to Senate Bill 2042

SB 2042, enacted in 1998, was co-authored by Senate Education Chair Dede Alpert and Assembly Education Chair Kerry Mazzoni. The comprehensive reform measure was sponsored by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Senate Bill 2042 called for:

- Implementing new standards to govern all aspects of teacher preparation, including subject matter studies, professional preparation, induction into teaching, and continuing growth;
- Redesigning teacher preparation to provide an undergraduate option to integrating subject matter studies with pedagogy and field experiences in teaching;
- Imbedding a standards-based teacher performance assessment in teacher preparation programs, particularly during student teaching, to assure teacher quality,

provide timely feedback to candidates and inform induction support providers about each beginning teacher's strengths and needs;

- Insuring that conventional and alternative preparation programs, including district intern programs, meet state standards as determined by the Commission; and
- Providing an induction program for every beginning teacher in California.

SB 1422 (Bergeson, 1992), the precursor to SB 2042, led to the most comprehensive review of teacher credential requirements in California history. All of the requirements for earning and renewing basic teacher credentials were re-examined in relation to research and practice over the preceding decade. What set this particular work apart from earlier reform efforts was that it was a comprehensive, systemic look at the entire teacher certification structure, from pre-service preparation to induction into teaching. Credential policies at every stage were examined not in isolation, but in conjunction with each other.

The Commission employed several strategies in conducting the review that was mandated by SB 1422, including an advisory panel, invitational forums on teacher credential issues and ongoing discussion with organizations representing teachers, teacher educators, administrators, school boards, county offices, parents, and other citizens. In addition, the Commission convened eight regional networks of mixed groups of stakeholders, both to recommend specific options and policies to the advisory panel, and to react to policies that were under consideration by the panel and the Commission. Finally, the Commission focused attention on particular areas of concern, such as the preparation of classroom teachers for the full inclusion of students with disabilities, by creating small task forces of experts in each area. All in all, thousands of California educators and other citizens were involved in the SB 1422 review.

Policy Issues Reviewed by the SB 1422 Advisory Panel

While the array of informational reports reviewed by the SB 1422 Panel was very broad, there were several key issues or questions around which the Panel's work was organized:

The credentialing system had evolved in a piecemeal fashion over time, resulting in a series of requirements that did not necessarily connect with one another. A clear priority for the panel was to work toward creating a new system wherein the different phases of preparation were well articulated.

- To what extent can or should the preparation, induction and ongoing professional development of individual teachers be developmentally connected or linked?
- Should all beginning teachers participate in an induction program in which they receive support and assessment during their first years as salaried teachers in the profession?

The SB 1422 review was conducted at the conclusion of the California New Teacher Project (CNTTP). The CNTTP, which evolved from a pilot project into the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program, clearly demonstrated the value of an induction experience for new teachers. The pilot study showed that extension of preparation into the first two years of teaching results in teachers who are better prepared to meet the needs of all children and who stay in the teaching profession in significantly larger numbers. While the Panel strongly agreed with the need to provide an induction experience for all teachers, there were many issues that needed to be resolved with respect to how induction could be implemented statewide and how it could be financed.

- Should there be multiple pathways to a teaching credential? If so, what should be their common elements?

A clear consensus emerged among SB 1422 panel members that any new credentialing system should be more responsive to candidates coming from a range of life experiences. Many believed that individuals who decided on a teaching career early in their undergraduate years should have access to a well-integrated, four to five-year preparation program. Individuals who decided later on a teacher career, upon completion of their undergraduate degrees, needed access to a more streamlined preparation program that met the same standards, but was offered in a different configuration. Still other routes needed to be available to meet the needs of career-changers, those who enter the teaching profession after

years in other careers, as well as individuals who had completed at least some preparation in other states.

- To what extent can or should a new credentialing system facilitate collaboration between K-12 schools and post-secondary institutions in the preparation, induction and professional development of teachers?

While a certain level of collaboration existed between the institutions of higher education and local education agencies with respect to teacher preparation, there was growing interest in looking for ways to strengthen the role of local schools in the preparation of teachers.

- What role should individual candidate-based assessment play in a new credentialing system?

There was growing support for the use of a candidate-based assessment in credentialing, both to provide quality assurance to parents, student and others, and to determine the effectiveness of teacher preparation. However, there was no useable teacher assessment instrument at the time that would address both the content and performance concerns of the panel. Moreover, the cost of existing assessments that were deemed most reliable and valid was high. The panel determined that while the goal would be workable candidate-based assessment, care needed to be taken to allow for the budgetary and legal concerns that surfaced during deliberations on this issue.

The SB 1422 Panel held 18 meetings between September, 1995 and June 1997. Staffed by Mary Sandy and Marie Schrup, the Panel made its final report to the Commission in August of 1997. The work of the Advisory Panel was shaped by four over-arching goals: improve teacher recruitment, selection and access to the profession; establish clear standards for new teacher preparation programs; increase and improve professional accountability; and increase and improve professional collaboration and system evaluation. The Panel offered a total of 110 specific recommendations to meet these four goals.

The Omnibus Reform Bill that Almost Wasn't (Twice)

Despite the involvement of thousands of individuals and numerous years of review, the SB 1422 recommendations immediately were the subject of much debate and considerable opposition, particularly from school districts. With respect to preparation and assessment, the SB 1422 panel had recommended that school districts be required to administer an assessment of teacher competence during the first years of teaching. School districts objected on several grounds. First, they contended that colleges and universities, not school districts, were responsible for providing teacher education to credential candidates. Districts questioned how higher education could be held accountable for teacher quality if the assessment of teacher competence was administered after the candidate had already graduated from the teacher preparation program. Second, the panel recommended that school districts be the ones to recommend candidates for clear credentials. Districts said such a requirement was counter to an agreement reached under SB 813 (Hart, 1983) to decrease the time to obtain teacher tenure from three years to two in return for district discretion in dismissing beginning teachers who were deemed unsatisfactory. Opponents agreed that the proposed assessment requirement would *ipso facto* return school districts to an era of extensive, expensive and time-consuming litigation. Finally, districts wanted greater assurance that preliminary teacher credential candidates were prepared to teach upon graduating from a teacher preparation program.

With respect to creation of new credentials, based upon a review of research demonstrating unique developmental needs of middle school students, the SB 1422 Panel recommended a new middle school credential. However, representatives of school districts were seeking more flexibility in hiring teachers, not less. They expressed concern that creation of another credential would exacerbate the shortage of middle school teachers and make it more difficult to recruit and hire teachers based upon the unique needs of middle schools.

Finally, with respect to continuing professional growth, the SB 1422 Panel recommended issuing a document to those individuals charged with providing staff development to teachers. The Panel believed such a document would assure a higher level of quality in professional development. However, teachers and school districts objected to the proposal,

which they contended would require more time, money and effort on the part of educators providing staff development as well as their school districts.

The Legislature stepped in immediately to resolve these controversies prior to introduction of any enabling legislation. Senator Dede Alpert, who had been promised authorship of any measure emerging from the SB 1422 work, convened a hearing to review the SB 1422 Panel recommendations, giving school district representatives an opportunity to voice their concerns publicly. Meanwhile, Commission staff assured the Senator that discussions were occurring in earnest with representatives of key education entities regarding their objections. After airing their concerns, and receiving assurance from Commission staff that these concerns had been heard, the Senator and the witnesses offered to give the Commission additional time to craft a viable legislative proposal.

Meanwhile, Commissioners themselves were close to tabling the entire SB 1422 report. At one crucial Commission meeting, the Commission received a large number of objections from education representatives. After listening to the testimony, staff to the Commission's Office of Governmental Relations requested time to meet with representatives of school districts, county offices and others to find a way to preserve the core of the SB 1422 recommendations while working to remove the many legitimate objections from the field.

Over the next several months, countless meetings were held with representatives of key education stakeholder groups. At the end of that period, the governmental relations staff presented a legislative proposal that gained the support of these groups as well as the Commission. The assessment called for by the Panel would be required within the preliminary preparation program. Thus, higher education would be held accountable for candidate performance; parents, schools and districts would be assured that candidates graduated ready to teach; and candidates would get feedback—as well as assistance—to meet a set of expectations concerning what teachers should know and be able to do. With this revised structure well in hand, the Commission insisted that the Panel drop its proposals for a middle school credential and a staff development provider certificate. Senate Bill 2042 was ready for introduction.

Senate Appropriations Staff Questions the Need for New Teacher Assessment

SB 2042 enjoyed relatively smooth sailing in the Senate Education Committee; however, Senate Appropriations Committee staff questioned the need for a mandated assessment in teacher preparation programs. Staff argued that some colleges and universities were already conducting high quality assessments and questioned the need for an appropriation to implement an assessment statewide. In a series of discussions with Appropriations Committee staff, Commission staff Linda Bond and David Wright suggested that a statewide assessment would evaluate all beginning teachers were evaluated on their knowledge and performance against a common set of elements. In addition, parents and school administrators would be assured that beginning teachers had specified levels of competency, and candidates would get the regular and consistent feedback, needed for them to improve. They noted that the assessment, together with accreditation reviews, would allow the State to compare the effectiveness of each college and university preparation program on the basis of uniform teaching standards. The \$1.1 million for the Teacher Performance Assessment remained in the bill after Wright and Bond made a commitment that this amount would be sufficient to develop the assessment. The \$1.1 million was later supplemented by \$10 million in federal funds obtained by the Commission through the efforts of the Professional Services Division.

The Assembly passed SB 2042 by a wide margin, however, when the measure reached Governor Wilson SB 2042 it was almost vetoed. The Governor was sponsoring a statewide ballot initiative, Proposition 8, which, among other requirements, would have mandated all certified school personnel to take a subject matter examination and submit a portfolio of lesson plans in the subject area to be taught prior to being assigned to a teaching position. Wilson's staff advised him that SB 2042 and Prop 8 might be in conflict and they recommended a veto. In marathon discussions with the Governor's education staff, Commission staff argued that Proposition 8 and SB 2042 would complement one another should Prop 8 gain the support of the electorate. Governor Wilson did sign SB 2042 to provide major reform in teacher preparation. Proposition 8 subsequently went down to defeat.

Evidence Mounts that Beginning Teacher Satisfaction and Retention are Tied to Support Activities

With the passage of Senate Bill 177, which allocated \$771 million in incentive funding for K-3 class size reduction, the teacher shortage has become even more acute. The process of preparing confident and competent teachers who will remain in the profession requires a systemic, long-range, well-integrated approach that begins at the undergraduate level in professional studies courses and extends well into the early years of teaching.

Marian Grace Wong-Park, Assistant Principal, Instructional Services for Hillsdale High School in San Mateo and the author of “The Relationship Between Assessment Procedures in Teacher Support Programs and Teachers’ Feelings of Support,” a doctoral dissertation.

Evidence was mounting that beginning teacher retention was tied to systematic support, assistance and continued preparation during the first years of teaching. According to *An Inventory of the Status of the Teaching Profession* (Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, 1988):

Teachers often begin their careers under difficult conditions: challenging classrooms, isolation from colleagues, and little or no feedback about their teaching performance. In 1988, California conducted a pilot program to help new teachers transition into their profession. The project was found to reduce attrition of first- and second-year teachers by two-thirds. Today the state has the California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA), widely recognized as an effective way to retain teachers and enhance their abilities. The question is whether these programs can scale up effectively to meet the needs of all teachers coming into the profession.

In the January 25, 1999 issue of EDCAL, Ms. Wong-Park reported her doctoral studies found:

- (1) Teachers positively related job retention, job satisfaction and feelings of job support to both the number and type of support activities.
- (2) Use of three or more assessment procedures resulted in significantly higher job satisfaction and greater feelings of support than fewer assessment procedures.
- (3) Generally, demographic characteristics did not affect teachers' job retention, job satisfaction or feelings of job support. Only in two instances were there significant differences. Women rated the importance of job satisfaction significantly higher than did men. High school teachers were significantly less likely to believe they would continue teaching.
- (4) Teachers participating in BTSA programs reported significantly feelings of job support and a high likelihood of remaining in teaching.

Governor Wilson Increases BTSA Funding

The BTSA program had grown each year since its inception in 1992, dramatically since 1995. In 1999-2000, Governor Wilson included funds in the state budget sufficient to enable 23,500 first and second year teachers to participate in the program, 90 percent of the eligible new teachers in California. (Governor Davis later continued the expansion of BTSA, including enough funding to allow 26,500 new teachers to participate in the program.)

Expansion was coupled with the development of a model formative assessment system. Beginning in 1998-99, the Commission and the Department of Education offered the California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST) to local education agencies participating in BTSA. In this model, used in most local beginning teacher induction programs, mentors learn how to manage an integrated process of

assessment and assistance to provide support, feedback and continued training in 10 key areas of what beginning teachers are expected to know and be able to do.

Expansion also was coupled with a regional structure for program support. The state agencies established a regional structure in which highly experienced BTSA Cluster Consultants provided program support in each of five geographic regions of the state. The consultants assisted in recruiting effective support providers, coordinating training plans, implementing CFASST, and in answering questions from newer local program managers.

Finally, expansion was accomplished together with adoption of new standards for program accountability based on the pilot study results. The standards defined and described the quality of support services for new teachers, the care with which each new teacher's performance is to be assessed and govern the training of mentors, assessors and site administrators in each program.

One of the most significant outcomes of the first California New Teacher Project and then BTSA was the ability of participating districts to retain teachers in the profession. National studies conducted in the late 1980s and early 1990s indicated that some school districts typically lost up to 50 percent of their beginning teachers within the first five years of teaching. Districts participating in the CNTP pilot project, on the other hand, were able to demonstrate a new teacher retention rate of over 90 percent during the three-year study. While the BTSA Program expanded to include over 872 of the 1000 school districts in the state, data from the CERC continued to show that teacher retention is one of the most significant outcomes of the BTSA Program.

Creation of the Teacher Performance Assessment

When Governor Wilson signed Senate Bill 2042 in 1988 he ushered in a new era for teaching assessments. Pursuing a systematic approach to teacher preparation and accountability, Wilson and legislators sought to ensure that all future teachers had specific information on their strengths and areas that needed improvement. They wanted to hold teacher preparation programs accountable for assisting teachers to master a set of common skills and abilities. Importantly, they wanted to assure school districts, parents and students that credentialed

teachers had already demonstrated their ability to teach successfully in classroom. Senate Bill 2042 required all Preliminary Teaching Credential candidates to pass a teaching performance assessment prior to being awarded a credential. Under the new approach to preparation and accountability, the required teaching assessment was to be aligned to the new SB 2042 statewide teacher preparation standards, which were in turn aligned with State Board of Education adopted K-12 Student Academic Content Standards. To fulfill the requirement under SB 2042, accredited teacher preparation programs could use the California Teaching Performance Assessment developed by the Commission or develop their own assessment, provided it too was aligned to state standards for teachers and students.

In June of 2002, the Commission contracted with Educational Testing Service to develop four performance assessment tasks, a candidate handbook, task-specific rubrics, benchmark cases, independent scoring cases, assessor training materials and information resources for use by institutions that chose to implement the CA TPA rather than develop their own assessment. The ETS assessment consists of four separate tasks; each task focuses on a different aspect of teaching practice. These tasks are inter-related yet separate and increase in complexity as the teacher candidates move through them. These tasks collectively measure aspects of the Teaching Performance Expectations that describe what all California beginning teachers need to know or be able to do to qualify for Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credentials.

In Task 1: Principles of Content-Specific and Developmentally Appropriate Pedagogy, teacher candidates are given the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge of principles of developmentally appropriate pedagogy, of specific pedagogical skills for subject matter instruction as well as interpretation and use of assessment, and of adaptation of content for English learners and students with special needs.

In Task 2: Connecting Instructional Planning to Student Characteristics for Academic Learning, teacher candidates are given the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to learn important details about a small group of learners and to design a lesson that is shaped by those contextual details.

In Task 3: Classroom Assessment of Academic Learning Goals, teacher candidates are given the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to design standards-based, developmentally appropriate student assessment activities in the context of a small group of students and a specific lesson. In addition, candidates will demonstrate their ability to assess student learning and to diagnose student needs from individual responses to the assessment activities.

In Task 4: Academic Lesson Design, Implementation, and Reflection after Instruction, teacher candidates are given the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to design a standards-based lesson for a class of students, implement that lesson making appropriate use of class time and instructional resources, meet the differing needs of individuals within the class, manage instruction and student interaction, assess student learning, and analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson.

Accreditation Reform Initiative

From its inception under the Ryan Act, the Commission had engaged in review and approval of educator preparation programs, the teaching methodology programs offered by colleges and universities. Professional accreditation is designed to ascertain and verify that programs are operated with sufficient resources, maintain qualified personnel, and meet California's statutory requirements and state standards of quality. In the early years of the Commission no individual assessment of candidate qualifications was required. In fact, it was not until passage of the California Basic Skills Test was placed into the Education Code that an assessment was required of those completing a professional educator preparation program. Program accreditation was the approach employed by California and other states to determine that both the content and quality of such programs was sufficient. With the advent of the CBEST requirement, accreditation and assessment began to be integrated to form a system designed to ensure that teacher candidates are provided:

- The content necessary to be successful in assisting all students to master state standards for students.

- Sufficient opportunities to acquire the skills and abilities necessary to succeed in fulfilling their professional responsibilities in schools.
- Preparation that is appropriate for the assignment of particular responsibilities in schools.

When coupled with candidate assessment, accreditation is designed to provide assurance to the public, students, candidates and the profession that candidates have achieved a certain level of competence in the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to successfully meet the requirements of their assignment. Together, assessment and accreditation determine not only candidate competence, but also whether institutions of higher education with credential programs provide appropriate and sufficient opportunities for candidates to become competent. In enacting the 1996 mandate that all California elementary and special education credential candidates pass the reading instruction competence assessment (RICA), the Legislature specified that testing could occur only after the Commission had reviewed and approved each institution's reading instruction program. This stipulation by the Legislature was designed to ensure that candidates would be provided the instruction necessary to success on the exam.

Senate Bill 148, carried by Senator Marian Bergeson in 1988 and incorporating recommendations from the Commons Commission, contained provisions designed to reform the Commission's program review and accreditation process. A portion of SB 148 called for the creation of an Accreditation Council that would undertake a systematic review of current accreditation procedures, review national accreditation procedures and practices and propose a new model for ensuring that credential programs were both effective and of high quality.

In fulfilling the statutory mandates for program accreditation under the Bergeson accreditation reform provisions, the Commission completed three phases of work. The initial phase was a period of experimentation in discrepancy model evaluation. The Commission developed a series of guidelines for its credential programs that included both input and content statements, and then required all educator programs to write program documents explaining how the program met each of the guidelines. These Program Approval Review Documents were used by visiting teams of educators to examine whether the program was, in

fact, doing all the things it said it would do in the approved program document submitted. The size and training of the team that conducted the site visits varied in the early years of the Commission. The dominant perception by higher education faculty and administrators was that the teams were too large and too poorly trained to be effective or helpful.

The second phase consisted of the movement to a standards-based program approval system. The guidelines were replaced with standards developed by teams of practitioners, university faculty, and other specialists, and adopted by the Commission after extensive public hearings. The size of visiting teams was reduced while training offered for teacher members was expanded from one to three days. Handbooks were prepared based on evaluation data collected in the early 1990s, and the Commission developed pro-active materials and programs to help institutions prepare more effectively for program approval visits. While these efforts assisted to some degree, the Commission was concerned that lingering problems of phase one seemed to be resistant to modification.

At the same time, policy makers in postsecondary education were interested in streamlining activities and obtaining more efficient results from the varying accreditation requirements imposed on them. Of particular concern to the California State University system was the preference for national accreditation for their schools and colleges of education. This systemwide preference was difficult to address since the national accreditation agency and the Commission did not have efficient and effective mechanisms for conducting joint visits. Postsecondary institutions also expressed the concern that the Commission's standards, even though adopted after extensive public hearings, were limiting the creativity of these institutions.

As a result of SB 148, an advisory council of twenty California educators was chosen to engage in the process of reviewing existing practices, both within the state and the nation, and recommending a new approach to the Commission. The Advisory Council took almost five years to reach a final set of recommendations that comprised the Accreditation Framework. These recommendations were adopted by the Commission in May of 1993, and codified through the enactment of SB 655, Bergeson, during the 1993 Legislative Session.

The key elements of the Accreditation Framework included the creation of a standing committee of six K-12 individuals and six postsecondary education individuals, initially elected by the Commission, who would make the legal determination of accreditation status for each college or university that offered a credential program. This standing committee would review the visiting team reports, hear from a representative of the institution being visited and make an accreditation decision about the institution and all of its credential programs. This requirement for a single accreditation decision was in keeping with the practice of national accrediting bodies, but was a signal change for the Commission. Previously, each credential program was subject to individual approval, based upon standards met. Under the change, approval for the college or university could not be garnered until all programs met state standards. Thus, a college or university could have some programs with full approval and others on probation. The thrust of the Accreditation Framework was to encourage the institution to take responsibility for the quality and effectiveness of all of its credential programs rather than permitting satisfactory and unsatisfactory programs to co-exist. Once the Committee determined that national standards were indeed comparable to California standards, the Accreditation Framework called for the implementation of national standards. In addition, the Framework permitted national accrediting bodies to act on behalf of the Commission in the accrediting of specialized credentials, provided that the national body met California performance requirements as established by the Committee on Accreditation.

The Framework also called for significant improvements in the training of those individuals selected to conduct the site reviews. Finally, the Framework encouraged programs to request reviews based upon experimental or alternative standards in an effort to foster serious research into new, innovative models of teacher education. The Committee on Accreditation made its first annual report to the Commission, as required by the Bergeson Act, in August 1995. It takes twelve to eighteen months for universities to prepare for an accreditation visit. Therefore, the Committee officially began making accreditation decisions for the Commission on Teacher Credentialing in the Fall of 1997 toward the end of Governor Wilson's second term.

California Basic Educational Skills Test and Lawsuit

Inherent in Leo Ryan's conceptualization of the Commission was a belief that individuals could demonstrate competence for state licensure through either coursework or state-administered standardized examinations. Leo Ryan envisioned a testing route as preferable to a program completion route, since he believed that educator licensure could attain the level of confidence enjoyed by other professions only if its assessment practices were similar to law and medicine. Thus, the Commission, from its very beginnings, was expected to develop a battery of examinations to enable individuals to verify their competence. However, financial resources necessary to construct such examinations was not made available and, for many years, the Commission was forced to use "off-the-shelf" examinations. While these extant examinations were psychometrically valid and reliable, they had not been developed specifically for California and, thus, were never fully aligned with the California public school curricula or California expectations for the education profession.

It is also important to note that these tests were, essentially, exit examinations. Candidates who otherwise would have completed approved undergraduate academic majors in the subject or subjects to be taught in the public schools, or approved programs of professional preparation, could bypass the approved coursework by demonstrating on the appropriate exam that they already possessed the knowledge taught through approved programs. For the first decade of the Commission's history, these optional examinations were the only candidate-based assessments the Commission used to make licensure decisions. This was to change in the early 1980s. When Gary Hart, a member of the California Legislature from Santa Barbara, successfully carried legislation to require virtually all credential candidates to pass a basic skills exam in reading, writing and mathematics. No longer would the possession of a baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution of postsecondary education confer basic education skills for future teachers.

When Hart's measure was signed into law the Commission sought a testing contractor with the necessary expertise to create a basic skills examination. The Educational Testing Service of Princeton New Jersey, the largest testing company in the United States, won the contract to develop, administer, score, and monitor the test. After the typical period of test development, items bias review, field testing, and validation of the applicability to test

specifications to the basic work of the all educators, the California Basic Skills Test was first administered in California in 1983. There was intense public interest in the initial test results, which were published in the media. Despite the fact that test results were published by the name of the institution where the candidate completed her or his undergraduate degree, resulting publicity focused on teacher education programs that had the lowest pass rates on CBEST. High pass rates were assumed to confer some semblance of quality on the teacher education program while those programs that had low pass rates were deemed of poor quality. Almost no one raised the question of how a candidate could fail the CBEST and yet earned a baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution.

It was also the case that those teacher education programs that enrolled the largest number of under-represented students intended to have lower CBEST pass rates than programs that enrolled relatively few under-represented students. This fairly persistent disparity in pass rate across racial and ethnic groups led several public interest law groups to begin tracking the CBEST. The negative publicity over CBEST pass rates (which were in the mid-80% area overall and rose to almost 90% over time) led some teacher education programs to use the CBEST as an admissions screen. This was the case despite the Legislature's suggestion that the exam be used instead as an exit screen before licensure. Thus, some critics raised the issue of discrimination against minorities and urged policy-makers to reconsider the CBEST as a tool for improving the teaching profession.

Finally, in the late 1980s, a federal lawsuit was filed by a Bay Area public interest law firm with long-standing interests in issues related to testing discrimination, charging that the CBEST was biased and unfairly discriminatory against racial and ethnic minorities. While a complete analysis of this landmark case requires an entire book, the issues joined in the lawsuit touched upon a number of key policy issues in education.

First was the issue of using a "high stakes" examination as a single point screening mechanism for licensure. Prior to the development of the CBEST, all examinations for licensure had been optional. Candidates could either complete approved programs of professional preparation or take an examination. Testing difficulties, test phobias, or other problems could be worked around through the completion of coursework. The law requiring that candidates demonstrate competence in basic skills was enacted to screen out those

candidates who had unacceptable low levels of skill in the critical areas of reading, writing and math, and provided no coursework alternative. Regulations implementing the law required each candidate to pass an examination and earn a combination of scores on each of the assessments to achieve an over-all passing score. While the testing company did make provisions for individuals with disabilities, those testing accommodations could not and did not alter the fundamental nature and expectations of the test itself.

Second, the accumulative data were clear that certain racial and ethnic groups had lower pass rates on CBEST than other groups. And these same groups had low representation in California's teaching force while these groups had rising representation among California's schoolchildren. Moreover, all the CBEST takers had already entered or completed college so that the test was perceived by some as denying entrance to the education profession to a group of individuals who were already under-represented among college students and graduates.

Third, the CBEST lawsuit touched on what general knowledge all educators were expected to have in order to carry out the work expected of all of them. Earlier attempts to set minimum standards for entrance to certain professions had been challenged on the basis that the test was not aligned to the work requirements of the employee. The courts had ruled that any examination had to be clearly aligned with the minimum work expectations of the job. For example, if one were hiring cooks, knowledge of proper food-handling techniques could be argued to be an essential task required of all cooks while knowledge of French, although possibly helpful, could not be considered essential. Since the CBEST was not about teaching, nor did the examination contain any specifications focused on pedagogical or particular academic content knowledge, some people argued that the test was not aligned to what all teachers and other educators did on the job.

Fourth, the lawsuit raised the question of how well the test was developed given the cultural, linguistic, and racial diversity of California. Questions were raised by the plaintiffs about the processes used to develop test specifications, eliminate any items that might have bias in their language or cultural assumptions, eliminate any items that might have bias in their language or cultural assumptions, develop and field test new items for the test, and evaluate and score writing samples. While these were, for the most part, highly technical questions that turned

on best practices and proper test development techniques, they also reflected the challenge of developing fair and equitable instruments for assessing any type of knowledge or skill across a diverse group of individuals. All tests represent some level of trade-off between test specificity and the costs of developing and administering a test. Since the CBEST was given to such a large group of people each year, it needed to be simple to administer at multiple sites across the state, relatively brief in length, and relatively easy and quick to score. Moreover, since the examination was given to a large number of individuals each year (some years the number of test administrations exceeded 100,000), and since some individuals took the test more than once, the pool of test items needed to maintain test security and test validity and reliability was quite large. Finally, the CBEST regulations required each candidate to produce a writing sample that was graded by at least two trained scorers. Since this was not a case of multiple choice questions, the scoring rubrics used to determine whether a particular essay “passed” or not were of critical importance.

The lawsuit was tried in the 13th District of the federal courts. This district long had a reputation in legal circles for a high degree of social activism and a commitment to matters of social justice. While space precludes a detailed analysis of the various legal maneuvers by the lawyers on both sides, the outcome of the first trial was a full and complete vindication for the CBEST. The court ruled that the test was fair, was based upon reasonable expectations that all educators, regardless of what they taught, or where they taught should possess the level of knowledge and skill in reading, writing, and mathematics that was assessed by the CBEST. While the court acknowledged that there was a disparate impact of the test on certain groups of people, the nature of the work of educators, and the expectations of the public in sending its children to the public schools was such that requiring all licensed educators to meet these minimal standards was acceptable public policy and not an violation of civil rights.

The plaintiffs immediately appealed this decision to the appropriate federal appeals court. The panel of three judges assigned to hear the appeal also ruled in favor of the Commission and the CBEST, but did so for reasons not connected to the analysis and reasoning of the original trial court judge. The three-judge appeals court focused on the question of whether the Commission, acting on behalf of the Legislature and people of California, is the employer of the individuals seeking to take and pass the CBEST. In the original court case, the trial

judge had ruled that the Commission needed to meet the standard for essentialness of the test items that an employer would need to meet rather than the lower standard of essentialness and alignment expected of a licensing agency. The original court judge had argued that, since it was impossible to teach in the public schools of California without a license, and since earning a license required passage of the CBEST, the Commission was, in effect, an employer of public school credential holders. The appeals court dismissed that argument in appropriate and also argued that the state was immune to lawsuits of this sort.

The plaintiffs then asked for an “en banc” review. This required all of the judges in the federal appeals court district (some thirteen federal judges in all) to review both the original trial cases and the first appeals case. The “en banc” review resulted in the upholding of both the original trial judge’s decision and the first appeal judges’ decision. There were, of course, some dissenting views, and the Commission was denied any financial relief from the plaintiffs, but the basic policy and psychometric decision of the Commission were upheld by the federal courts. At this point, the plaintiffs decided to make no further appeals.

In all, the case lasted about seven years and cost the Commission over \$4 million dollars in legal fees. Ironically, since the Commission is a special fund agency and takes no money from the State’s general fund, teacher licensing fees paid for the defense of CBEST. And while the courts upheld the right of the state to assure that those who teach its children can demonstrate, through typical standardized testing situations, a basic ability to read and write and compute, the issue of how someone could complete high school and graduate from college without such knowledge or skill remains to be determined.

The Commission, in its own internal studies regarding the passing rates on CBEST, made some inroads to understanding the complex problem of testing pass-rates on the part of certain groups. It was found, for example, that if individuals would seek test-taking skill instruction, pass rates rose significantly for those groups. Frequently, if an under-represented candidate failed the CBEST once, they never re-took the examination, whereas individuals who did take the exam a second time often passed. Additionally, those candidates who took the CBEST within a few years of formal schooling did better than those who had graduated many years ago. Lastly, there were some correlations between pass rates on the CBEST and breadth of undergraduate coursework. Students who had taken undergraduate coursework

that included mathematics, science, literature, history, and the humanities did better on the CBEST than those with more focused undergraduate preparation.

In the long run, the expensive lessons learned by the California through the CBEST lawsuit can inform all current and future assessment work undertaken by the State. Hiring highly competent test development firms, doing the careful work of aligning test specifications with accepted and validated work expectations, field testing the test specifications with a diverse population of respondents with particular attention to under-represented groups, employing bias reviews throughout the test development process, and ensuring that the on-going item analyses and test item pool development all adhere to and support the highest standards of the testing profession and are continuously aligned to the California context will help in assuring that any new assessments will meet the legal tests that are almost inevitable in contemporary society.

Wilson's Tenure as Governor Comes to a Conclusion

Dr. Carolyn Ellner, the last Commission Chair under the Wilson administration, concluded her term by stating:

Together, with the able leadership of the Commission's Executive Director, Dr. Sam Swofford, and the tremendous efforts of the Commission staff, we have worked with our constituents, with the Legislature, and with the Governor to create a system to support and implement reform in all arenas of teacher education. The recommendations of the SB 1422 Advisory Panel for the Review of Teaching Credential Requirements are now in the implementation phase through the efforts of the newly established SB 2042 Advisory Panel for the Development of Teacher Preparation Standards. The highly touted Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program has been fully funded. Alternative routes for teaching credentials, such as intern programs, have flourished and paraprofessionals are now supported in their efforts to fulfill their dream of teaching. Teachers prepared in other states find it less burdensome to receive a

California teaching credential and pre-interns are supported as they work toward full credentialing.